



***NASA DESK GUIDE  
for  
Human Resources  
Operations Assessment***

***NASA Headquarters  
Office of Human Capital Management  
Workforce Systems and Assessment Division  
March 2006***

## Reviewers Tips for Using This Guide

The Agency and Centers are accountable for systematically conducting self-assessments of their human capital management to ensure that its personnel practices are consistent with policy and program objectives. In broad terms, an Agency's internal self-assessment covers the goals, results, leadership, processes and work climate for customer service within applicable laws and regulation, and may include such things as how it:

- uses first-hand knowledge and insights of employees and employee groups to develop responsive human resource policies,
- integrates human resource strategies with Center organizational and core mission practices,
- sustains the leadership and employee characteristics needed to achieve specific mission goals,
- benchmarks and streamlines personnel administrative processes, and
- ensures that human resource management decisions fall within the scope of applicable legal and ethical considerations.

This Guide primarily serves Agency-led or Center-led assessments on principal regulatory and procedural program items for human resources operations, however:

- Specific items are targeted (by an asterisk throughout the Guide and compiled in Section F) for review under the agency implementation of the Federal Manager's Financial Integrity Act and OMB Circular A-123.
- Assessment guidance on benefits programs is available in OPM's *Self Evaluation Guide for Agency Administration of Employee Benefit Programs*.
- Work environment can be assessed using available Federal Human Capital Survey results.
- For assessment guidance on human resource management success indicators, refer to the General Accounting Office *Human Capital Self-Assessment Checklist for Agency Leaders* and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) *Human Capital Accountability and Assessment Framework*
- The *NASA Human Capital Accountability System* and Agency human capital strategic planning documents reference additional strategic metrics and milestones.

The Guide may be modified to encompass local procedural requirements and process checklists, expand sampling to include Agency/local concerns, or reflect recent changes in regulations and agency policy. Various case review checklists used by OPM and agency reviewers are available through the assessment program POC. Coordinate with the local Labor Relations Officer to identify and obtain guidance in assessing respective local collective bargaining contract provisions.

The Guide assumes a general familiarity with proper personnel functional operation by reviewers performing a self-assessment and may also serve as a reference tool for developmental assignments, for example: a trainee may be assigned to a senior HR specialist who can use the Guide for instruction, or an experienced HR specialist may use it to refresh or develop their knowledge in another program area. Additionally, reviewers of delegated examining must be certified in examining.

The reviewer is expected to review program policies and references, identify data collection needs (documents, cases, interviews, surveys etc.), develop a work plan, complete an analysis, and document findings in sufficient detail to serve as the basis for improvement or corrective action. Sampling suggestions in the Guide are to be used with judgment. Generally, a few actions of each specific type, somehow randomly selected, is all that is needed to feel confident that the sampling is a good faith test of a process. Moreover, the goal of sampling is to reflect on the health of operational quality control and not to just fix cases.

The Guide includes a column to document whether the review element was met or not met, describe how sampling was conducted, explain the need for improvement or corrective action and describe findings that are particularly noteworthy. As such, it serves as the reviewer's working papers and provides sufficient documentation in developing summary reports. It is advisable to maintain this documentation until the completion of a subsequent review. However, annual review documentation of delegated examining must be maintained for a period of 3 years to include a list of deficiencies and corrective actions whether the review was performed by OPM, Agency or other staff not directly associated with the delegated examining activity being reviewed.

A complete review of human resources operations is to be completed using this Guide (or an equivalent) at least once over a 3-year cycle. Required corrective actions shall begin at the time any deficiency is recognized with a follow-up assessment conducted within a year. An annual summary of assessment activity is to be provided by September 1 to Headquarters, Office of Human Capital Management.

# NASA Human Resources Operations Assessment

## Desk Guide Index

*(Revised sections are in bold italic)*

### **A. STAFFING**

1. Recruitment
2. Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program
3. ***Delegated Examining Authority***
4. ***Competitive Placement Plan***
5. ***PMF and Other Special Programs***
6. Probation Period
7. ***Experts and Consultants***
8. ***Non-Competitive Details***
9. Additional Staffing Authorities
10. Personnel Action Review

### **B. CLASSIFICATION AND POSITION MANAGEMENT**

1. ***Classification Practices***
2. ***Understanding of Classification***
3. ***Classification Standards***
4. ***Classification Appeal Decisions***
5. ***Position Management***

### **C. COMPENSATION**

1. Absence and Leave
2. Pay Adjustment for Supervisors
3. Annual Premium Pay
4. Highest Previous Rate
5. Hours of Duty
6. Overtime
7. Pay Rate Special Factors
8. ***Recruitment/Relocation/Redesignation/Retention Bonuses***
9. ***Student Loan Repayment Program***
10. ***Superior Qualifications***

### **D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS**

1. ***Performance Appraisal***
2. Incentive/Performance Awards Program
3. Suggestion/Employee Involvement Program
4. Quality Step Increases
5. Within-Grade Increases/Denials
6. Actions Based on Unacceptable Performance
7. Adverse Actions and Discipline
8. Appeals and Grievances
9. Employee Responsibilities and Conduct
10. Prohibited Personnel Practices
11. Drug Free Workplace Program

### **E. LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS**

1. Management Support
2. Consultation/Bargaining/Partnerships
3. Representation by Labor Organizations
4. Use of Official Time
5. Contingency Plans
6. Unfair Labor Practice Allegations/Grievances

### **F. MANAGEMENT CONTROLS**

1. Summary Report on Control Environment
2. Deficiency Resolution

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>1. RECRUITMENT</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 USC 7201; 5 CFR Part 720.101-305 -- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE A1</b>
<p>a. <b><u>Recruitment Planning</u></b></p> <p>(1) Is there a planned approach to determine and meet short range and long range recruitment needs that meets anticipated turn-over and obtains needed skills not available within the Installation?</p> <p>(2) Is the planned approach followed?</p> <p>(3) Are recruitment sources designed to reach all segments of society, including employees with disabilities, veterans, minority groups, etc.?</p> <p>(4) Are there indications of major problems in this area, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) management participation in plan development *</li> <li>(b) quality of candidates</li> <li>(c) timeliness of process</li> </ul> <p>b. <b><u>Recruitment Practices</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are the operating practices in accord with applicable laws and regulation?</p> <p>(2) Do operating practices promote economy and efficiency of recruitment operations?</p> <p>(3) Are travel costs considered reasonable including cost for interview trips? *</p> <p>(4) Have the recruiting sources been analyzed to determine which tend to be the most profitable?</p> <p>(5) Review the use of paid advertising in recruitment effectiveness, e.g. ratio of applicants vs. hires, costs, and success of advertising vs. non-advert methods.</p>	<p>*(5 CFR 720.204)</p> <p>(5 USC 2301)</p> <p>*(5 USC 5702)</p>

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>2. FEDERAL EQUAL OPPORTUNITY RECRUITMENT PROGRAM</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 720.101-305 &amp; Subpart B, FEORP; &amp; references below)</i> <b>PAGE A2</b>
<p>(1) Are the operating practices in accord with applicable laws and regulations?</p> <p>a. <b><u>Underrepresentation</u></b></p> <p>(1) Is there a method to determine underrepresentation of minorities and women by occupation groups at this Installation?</p> <p>(2) How was this method developed?</p> <p>b. <b><u>Recruitment Planning</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are targeted under-represented groups and positions identified in the recruitment plan?</p> <p>(2) How does the identification of under-represented groups or positions affect the recruitment plans?</p> <p>(3) Have potential causes of under-representation been identified? Have means to remedy this underrepresentation been identified?</p> <p>(4) Has underrepresentation declined in any occupation group?</p> <p>c. <b><u>Recruitment Practices</u></b></p> <p>(1) Have resources been allocated for external recruiting.</p> <p>(2) Are internal and external recruitment activities, including inter-agency activity, defined? Is visibility maintained with colleges and universities during depressed recruitment activity?</p> <p>(3) Have trainee and development jobs (through job redesign) been identified including bilingual/cultural skill requirements?</p> <p>(4) Have new recruitment methods and resources evolved from use of the plan?</p>	<p><i>(115 S.Ct. 2097, 1995 Adarand Decision)</i></p> <p><i>(115 S.Ct. 2097 (1995))</i></p>

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>3. DELEGATED EXAMINING AUTHORITY</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 332 &amp; references below)</i> <b>PAGE A3</b>
<p><b><u>SAMPLE</u>:</b> Select at least 7 appointments made under delegated examining procedures from actions taken during the period since the effective date of the most recent delegation agreement or during the preceding 12 months, whichever date is latest.</p> <p>(1) Is the position included in the delegation agreements?</p> <p>(2) Is delegated examining staff properly certified before independently performing examining duties? Does staff receive recertification training at least every 3 years?</p> <p>(3) Priority selection clearances:</p> <p>    (a) Were individuals entitled to selection priority in the Reemployment Priority List (RPL) properly selected?</p> <p>    (b) Were individuals entitled to selection priority under NASA's Career Transition Assistance Program (CTAP) and the Interagency Career Transition Assistance Program (ICTAP) properly selected?</p> <p>(4) Were the requirements of adequate public notice met, including open period, area of consideration and required notice information?</p> <p>(5) If a single notice is used to solicit both internal and external applications, does it contain language explaining that status candidates will only be considered under merit promotion procedures?</p> <p>(6) Are 10 point veterans informed of the conditions under which their applications will be retained?</p> <p>(7) Is there a process in place to retain applications from 10 point veterans for future consideration?</p> <p>(8) Was there proper documentation of the use and results of any supplemental application materials?</p> <p>(9) Are applications date stamped on receipt, postmarked envelopes retained and applications accepted in accordance with regulations?</p> <p>(10) Are minimum qualifications determined properly?</p>	<p><i>(Delegation Agreement)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegation Agreement, Delegated Examining Handbook (www.opm.gov/deu)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 330 Subpart B)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 330, Subpart F)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 330.102 &amp; Subpart F; 5 USC 3327; Delegation Agreement, 5 USC 2301)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegated Examining Handbook)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 332, Subpart B)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 332, Subpart B; Delegated Examining Handbook)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 332; NPG 3300)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegation Agreement)</i></p> <p><i>(Qualifications Standards Handbook)</i></p>

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>3. DELEGATED EXAMINING AUTHORITY - (continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 332 -- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE A4</b>
<p>(11) Was the Aerospace Technologist standard used to evaluate applicants qualifying on the basis of education for AST positions?</p> <p>(12) Are selective factors properly documented and required for performance on the job?</p> <p>(13) If AST qualifications are based on the unconditional acceptance provisions, is the file properly documented?</p> <p>(14) If degree or specific course work is required, is proper documentation obtained and maintained in file?</p> <p>(15) Are applications reviewed for citizenship requirements?</p> <p>(16) Is there proper documentation of the required job analysis?</p> <p>(17) Is veterans preference properly adjudicated including OPM medical determinations when required?</p> <p>(18) Are ineligible ratings based on suitability or medical considerations properly adjudicated?</p> <p>(19) Are applicants properly listed in rank or relative standing order?</p> <p>(20) Are procedures for breaking ties established and followed?</p> <p>(21) Are procedures followed for issuing certificates, adding names of veterans entitled to reopen examinations, adding names of individuals entitled to priority consideration due to lost consideration and issuing supplemental certificates?</p> <p>(22) Are selections from certificates properly made in accordance with the rule of 3?</p> <p>(23) Are objections and passovers properly documented and approved (forwarded to OPM for final approval when required)?</p> <p>(24) Is selection based on 10 point preference fully documented?</p> <p>(25) Was selection made within the time frames required for selection?</p>	<p><i>(NPG 3300)</i></p> <p><i>(Qualifications Standards Handbook)</i></p> <p><i>(NPG 3300)</i></p> <p><i>(Qualifications Standards Handbook)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 338; NPG 3300)</i></p> <p><i>(29 CFR 1607, Uniform Guidelines; 5 CFR 300.103)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegation Agreement; Guide to Processing Personnel Actions; 5 CFR 332 and 339)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 339) and (5 CFR 731)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 332)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegated Examining Handbook)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 332)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 332)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 332; 5 USC 3318(b))</i></p> <p><i>(Guide for Processing Personnel Actions, Chptr 7)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegated Examining Handbook)</i></p>

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>3. DELEGATED EXAMINING AUTHORITY - (continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 332 -- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE A5</b>
<p>(26) If certificate is cancelled/not used, is reason documented in case file?</p> <p>(27) Are applicants notified of the status of their applications for the position(s) for which they applied?</p> <p>(28) Are notifications to nonselected eligibles processed consistently?</p> <p>(29) Have procedures for reconsideration of examining decisions been established and followed?</p> <p>(30) Are mistakes in certification corrected in accordance with required procedures?</p> <p>(31) Are audits of actions taken on certificates conducted and properly documented?</p> <p>(32) Is a file or record maintained for priority referral of eligibles who lost opportunity for certification or who did not receive bona fide consideration?</p> <p>(33) Are the requirements of the Freedom of Information or Privacy Act being met e.g., appropriate documentation including denial of disclosure, etc.?</p> <p>(34) Are recordkeeping requirements including disposition of records met in accordance to the schedules provided?</p> <p>(35) Is there complete documentation in the file so that actions can be reconstructed, including documentation of candidate declinations, failure to respond to inquiry, and failure to report for an interview?</p> <p>(36) Are quarterly reports properly prepared and submitted on time?</p> <p>(37) Are periodic operational reviews to assure regulatory compliance conducted in accordance with the requirements?</p> <p>(38) Are procedures (including recordkeeping requirements) for Direct Hire Authorities followed in accordance with the requirements?</p>	<p><i>(Delegated Examining Handbook)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegation Agreement)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegated Examining Handbook)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegated Examining Handbook)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 213.3202; 5 CFR 315.710)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 294)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegation Agreement; Records Retention Schedule)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegation Agreement)</i></p> <p><i>(Delegated Examining Handbook)</i></p>







<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>4. COMPETITIVE PLACEMENT PLAN - (continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 335.101-105; NHB 3335.1C &amp; Amendments)</i> <b>PAGE A8</b>
<p>(12) Is basic eligibility of applicants for promotion determined by screening against minimum qualification standards and time-in-grade and time after competitive appointment requirements?</p> <p>(13) Is basic eligibility of candidates determined accurately?</p> <p>(14) Do selecting officials participate in the job analysis procedures in determining the knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) to be rated in identifying the best available candidates for a position</p> <p>(15) Are KSA’s properly developed and supported by sufficient documentation so that the process reveals appropriate technical steps showing evidence of job-relatedness?</p> <p>(16) Is use of rating panels/SMES in rating for various kinds and levels of positions in accordance with NPG 3335.1 (and any local supplements)?</p> <p>(17) Are promotion certificates properly prepared?</p> <p>(18) Do areas of consideration used produce sufficient candidates for consideration by selecting officials?</p> <p>(19) Are selections made in accordance with the provisions of NPG 3335.1 (and any local supplements)?</p> <p>(20) Are selections documented on promotion certificates by selecting officials?</p> <p>(21) Are the candidates selected released from their positions in accordance with the provisions of NPG 3335.1 (and only local supplements)?</p> <p>(22) Is information to candidates for competitive placement provided in accordance with provisions of NPG 3335.1 (and any local supplements)?</p> <p>(23) Are employee complaints concerning the Merit Promotion Program handled in accordance with the provisions of NPG 3335.1 (and any local supplements)?</p>	<p><i>(CH 3, Sec 3.10)</i></p> <p><i>(CH 3, Sec 3.10)</i></p> <p><i>(CH 3, Sec 3.11)</i></p> <p><i>(CH 3, Sec 3.11; Appendix A)</i></p> <p><i>(CH 3, Sec 3.11)</i></p> <p><i>(CH 3, Sec 3.12)</i></p> <p><i>(CH 3, Sec 3.4)</i></p> <p><i>(CH 3, Sec 3.11, 3.12, 3.13)</i></p> <p><i>(CH 3, Sec 3.12, Appendix A)</i></p> <p><i>(CH 3, Sec 3.14)</i></p> <p><i>(Appendix B)</i></p> <p><i>(CH 3, 301)</i></p>



<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>5. SPECIAL PROGRAMS (continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <b>PAGE A10</b>
<p><b>c. <u>Employees with Disabilities &amp; Disabled Veterans Programs</u></b></p> <p>(1) Is there an installation Affirmative Action Program Plan for the Employment of Disabled Individuals and Disabled Veterans?</p> <p>(2) Are managers aware of delegated authorities available to hire employees with disabilities?</p> <p><b>d. <u>Student Education Employment Programs</u> (Student Temporary Employment Program and Student Career Experience Program)</b></p> <p><b><u>SAMPLE</u>:</b> Select a few cases under each of the above programs.</p> <p>(1) Are eligibility requirements for candidates being met?</p> <p>(2) Are positions for student employment programs being properly classified?</p> <p>(3) Do students have performance plans in place?</p> <p>(4) Is there a signed agreement with the student’s university or college? (Student Career Experience Program only)</p> <p>(5) Are Program requirements for non-competitive conversion satisfied? (Student Career Experience Program only)</p> <p><b>e. <u>Non-permanent Appointments</u></b></p> <p><b><u>SAMPLE</u>:</b> Select five temporary appointments.</p> <p>Review the need for an applicant supply system for Temporary appointments outside the register.</p> <p>If a need exists, has it been established and maintained in accordance with regulatory requirements?</p> <p>Are there procedures for its use and are they followed?</p>	<p>(5 CFR 720.301-307; NASA AAP)</p> <p>[5 CFR 213.3102(t)&amp;(u); 213.3301(k)]</p> <p>(5 CFR 213.3202(a) and (b))</p> <p>[5 CFR 213.3202(a) and (b)]</p> <p>[5 CFR 213.3202(a)(11) and (b)(14)]</p> <p>[5 CFR Part 430 Subpart B]</p> <p>[5 CFR 213.3202(b)(12)]</p> <p>[5 CFR 213.3202(b)(11)]</p> <p>(5 CFR 333)</p>

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>6. PROBATION PERIOD</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 315 -- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE A11</b>
<p><b><u>SAMPLE</u>:</b> Select a maximum of 5 actions each of (a) appointments and (b) first assignments to a supervisory/managerial position.</p> <p>Is there a system for making probationary period determinations (for both appointment and first assignment to a supervisory/managerial position)?</p> <p>Is there adherence to regulatory requirements?</p>	
<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>*7. EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>*(42 USC 2473(c)(9); 5 USC 3109; 5 CFR 304 -- more references below)</i>
<p>(1) Have services been obtained for an appropriate purpose and with appropriate levels of approval?</p> <p>(2) Do appointees meet the OPM definition of “expert” with no preference given to annuitants?</p> <p>(3) Was there appropriate documentation of pre-employment review and approval of individual expert/consultant?</p> <p>(4) Has a system for internal review during employment been established and followed? Does the system monitor the actual number of days each expert or consultant works?</p> <p>(5) Have statements of Financial Interest been obtained and reviewed in a timely manner?</p> <p>(6) Have pay rates been appropriately established?</p> <p>(7) Do services provided meet the organization’s specific need?</p>	<p><i>[NPR 3300.1A, CH 4; 5 CFR 304.103]</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 304.102)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 304.108)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 1900.3A)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 304.106)</i></p>

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>8. NON-COMPETITIVE DETAILS</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <b>PAGE A12</b>
<p>NOTE: Details requiring competition will be reviewed under the Competitive Placement Plan Review.</p> <p><b>a. <u>Details Within NASA</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are procedures in place to advise management concerning requirements, control and proper documentation?</p> <p>(2) Are details processed in accordance with legal requirements (120 day increments) and limited to shortest practicable time?</p> <p><b>b. <u>Details to Other Federal Agencies</u></b></p> <p>(1) Have there been details to other agencies or organizations?</p> <p>(2) Have requests been approved by the required level of authority?</p> <p>(3) Have these details been properly controlled and recorded.</p>	<p>(5 USC 3341)</p> <p>(5 USC 3341)</p> <p>(NPR 3300.1A, CH 8)</p> <p>(NPR 33001.A, CH 8)</p>

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>8. NON-COMPETITIVE DETAILS</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>5 USC 3371-3376; 5 USC 9808</i> <b>PAGE A13</b>
<p><b>c. <u>Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) Assignments</u></b></p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review at least two of four types of IPA assignments: (a) by detail from a non-Federal organization to NASA, (b) by temporary appointment to NASA while on leave without pay (LWOP) from a non-Federal organization, (c) by detail from NASA to a non-Federal organization, (d) by temporary appointment to a non-Federal organization while on LWOP from NASA.</p> <p>(1) Has a system been established to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Review and approve organizations for IPA participation?</li> <li>(b) Ensure that all proposed assignments, whether by detail or appointments (including extensions), are approved in advance by the appropriate official?</li> <li>(c) Monitor adherence to assignment and service time requirements?*</li> <li>(d) Establish and document OPF’s?</li> </ul> <p>(2) Was an IPA agreement, signed by NASA and the employee, prepared for each assignment, and comply with the requirements specified in the IPA checklist in Appendix C of the IPA Desk Guide?</p> <p>(3) Were proper pay rates established and are the salaries monitored?</p> <p>(4) Are copies of approval letters to organizations on file with the IPA agreements?</p> <p>(5) Have copies of participation approval letters to organizations and IPA agreement(s) been forwarded to Headquarters OHCM and to Center’s Financial Management Officer for file retention?</p> <p>(6) Do services provided meet the organization’s specific needs?</p>	<p>(5CFR Part 334, NPG 3300.1A, CH 6)</p> <p>*</p>



<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>9. ADDITIONAL STAFFING AUTHORITIES</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(42 USC 2473(c)(9); 5 USC 3109; 5 CFR 304 -- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE A14</b>
<p><b>a. <u>Advanced-in-hiring rates/Superior Qualifications</u></b></p> <p>(1) Is action properly documented?</p> <p>(2) Do re-appointments have a 90 day break in service if given advanced rate?</p> <p>(3) Was a recruitment bonus considered and documented?</p> <p><b>b. <u>Payment of Travel/Transportation to First Duty Post</u></b></p> <p>(1) Is payment under this authority in accordance with Federal Travel Regulations?</p> <p><b>c. <u>Payment of Travel for Interview at GS-13 and below</u></b></p> <p>(1) Does payment of expenses meet Federal Travel Regulations?</p> <p>(2) Are records of interview payments maintained for reconstruction purposes?</p> <p><b>d. <u>Time-Limited Promotions</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are Promotions made for limited term that does not exceed 5 years?</p> <p>(2) Are Competitive Placement Plan Procedures used?</p> <p>(3) Do employees receive written notice of conditions or promotions?</p> <p><b>e. <u>Conversion to Competitive from Excepted Appointments</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are requirements, including documentation requirements, for conversion of excepted employees to Competitive appointments fully met?</p>	<p><i>[5 USC 5333; 5 CFR 531.203 (b)]</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 572.101 to 103)</i></p> <p><i>(41 CFR Ch 301 to 304)</i></p> <p><i>(41 CFR Ch 301 to 304)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 335)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 315; Guide to Processing Personnel Actions)</i></p>

<b>A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>10. PERSONNEL ACTIONS REVIEW</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENT</b> <i>(Guide for Processing Personnel Action -- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE A15</b>
<p><b><u>SAMPLE</u>:</b> Randomly select 60-80 actions for the period covered by the preceding 12 months. A <u>Personnel Action Review Sampling Worksheet</u> is provided to cover most kinds of personnel actions.</p> <p>(1) All aspects of each action are to be reviewed.</p> <p>(2) Use NPPS data to count how many actions of each type have occurred during the selected time period and to generate lists of actions for selecting which cases to review.</p> <p>(3) Because sampling sizes may be quite small for a given type of action, the reviewer may need to expand the sample to determine if errors are isolated or have wider patterns of occurrence.</p> <p>(4) Determinations on qualifications of candidates, veterans preference determinations, propriety of actions, etc. will be coordinated between the member reviewing the actions and the members responsible for functional review.</p> <p>(5) Adequate random sampling can be assured if action case lists are pre-sorted only by action type (personnel action &amp; legal authority codes) and cases are selected using the random sample determiner described on the <u>Worksheet</u>.</p> <p>(6) Are personnel records maintained in accordance with requirements? *</p> <p>(7) Are personnel records properly safeguarded against any unauthorized access or the preparation of fictitious records? *</p>	

**A. STAFFING REVIEW ITEMS****10. PERSONNEL ACTION REVIEW (SAMPLING WORKSHEET)****PAGE A16**

Period Covered: _____	(A) # of Actions in Period		(B) # of Actions to Review	(C) Random Sample Determiner	(D) Added Actions
TYPE OF ACTION (ACTION CODES)					
1. CAREER APPTS (100, 500)					
2. CAREER CONDITIONAL APPTS (101, 501)					
3. EXCEPTED APPTS SCHED A&B (170-71, 570-71)					
4. SES APPOINTMENTS (142-149)					
5. CONVERSION TO SES APPT (542-43, 546, 548-49)					
6. TERM APPTS (108, 508)					
7. TEMPORARY APPTS (115, 515, 117, 517)					
8. CHANGE IN TENURE GROUP (180)					
9. TRANSFER (130)					
10. REINSTATEMENTS (140-41, 540-41)					
11. REASSIGNMENTS (721)					
12. DETAILS (730-732)					
13. PROMOTIONS (702, 703)					
14. QUALITY INCREASE (892)					
15. WITHIN-GRADE INCREASE (893, 888)					
16. CHANGE TO LOWER GRADE (713)					
17. SUSPENSIONS (450, 452)					
18. REMOVALS (330)					
19. RESIGNATIONS (317, 312)					
20. PAY ADJUSTMENT (894)					
TOTAL				XXXXXXXXXXXX	

(B) **# OF ACTIONS TO REVIEW:** In determining how many of each type of action to review, take into account any local factors such as previous review findings, new staff, recent changes in processing requirements, etc. Unless otherwise indicated, for each type of action choose from 3 to 8 cases for review.

(C) **RANDOM SAMPLE DETERMINER:** Divide the number of each action type (Column A) by the number of that type to be reviewed (Column B). The result (rounded down) represents the frequency determiner for the selection of actions to be reviewed. For example, if the number in Column A is 43 and the number of that kind of action to review is 5, then the frequency determiner for this action type is 8 ( $43/5 = 8.6$  rounded down). From a list of the 43 actions, select the 8th action and all subsequent actions based on a multiple of the determiner (in this case, the 8th, 16th, 24th, 32nd, and 40th action on the list).

(D) **ADDED ACTIONS:** Add at least one of each of the following cases for review if not already randomly selected. For APPTS or CONVERSIONS add a reemployed annuitant, part-time appt/conversion, VRA placement & Taper appt. For EXCEPT APPT (type 3) add an assistant for a deaf or blind employee, alien scientist, expert/consultant, COOP student & employee with disability. For TEMPORARY APPT (type 7) add a 30% disabled veteran. For PROMOTIONS (type 13) add a reclassification, upgrading & first assignment to a supervisory/managerial position. For WGI (type 15) add an increase withheld for both GS & GM employee. For CLG (type 16) add a case with retained grade/pay.



<b>B. CLASSIFICATION &amp; POSITION MGMT REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>1. CLASSIFICATION PRACTICES (continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 511.101-703-- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE B2</b>
<p>(h) Positions in certain scientific and engineering series are coded in accord with National Science Foundation scheme.</p> <p>(i) Student trainees are classified to the GS-XX99 series for the appropriate occupational group.</p> <p>(j) Written analyses are prepared for positions (1) whose classification basis is not readily apparent and (2) showing FES factor levels and point values where appropriate.</p>	<p><i>(Introduction to Position Classification Standards Appendix 2; OPM Operating Manual, The Guide to Personnel Data Standards)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 213.3202(b)(14); OPM Handbook of Occupational Groups and Series of Classes Definition of GS-099, General Student Trainee Series)</i></p> <p><i>(NPR 3510.1B (Currently under revision); The Classifier’s Handbook, Chapter 2, Chapter 3)</i></p>
<b>2. UNDERSTANDING OF POSITION MANAGEMENT AND CLASSIFICATION</b>	
<p>(1) Discussion with managers, supervisors, and the classification staff shows that they understand their roles and responsibilities in this area (assigning work, structuring positions, updating positions descriptions of subordinates when changes in work occur, etc.) and have received appropriate training or information on the subject</p>	<p><i>(Introduction to the Position Classification Standards, Section III NPR 3510.1B (Currently under revision))</i></p>

<b>B. CLASSIFICATION &amp; POSITION MGMT REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>3. CLASSIFICATION STANDARDS</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 511; Position Classification Handbook -- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE B3</b>
<p><b><u>SAMPLE</u>:</b> Review documentation on several occupations for which new position classification and job grading standards have been issued within the preceding 12 months.</p> <p>(1) Have new standards been applied to positions within a reasonable time period (i.e., within 12 months unless a longer period was requested from and approved by OPM through the Agency Classification Officer)?</p>	<p><i>(OPM Memo Subject: Change in Classification Implementation Policy, dtd January 20, 2006)</i></p>
<b>4. CLASSIFICATION APPEAL DECISIONS</b>	<i>(5 CFR 511.701-703)</i>
<p><b><u>SAMPLE</u>:</b> Review several classification appeal decisions over the last 2 years and check the OPF's of affected individuals.</p> <p>(1) Were corrective personnel actions processed in a timely fashion, e.g., within four pay period unless decisions specified a later date?</p> <p>(2) Are classification appeals filed appropriately and processed within required timeframes?</p>	<p><i>(NPR 3510.1B (Currently under revision))</i></p>

<b>B. CLASSIFICATION &amp; POSITION MGMT REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>5. POSITION MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 511-- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE B4</b>
<p>(1) Do local issuances on position management comply with NASA requirements? *</p> <p>(2) Interview local program official to ascertain that specific measures and procedures are in place and designed to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) accomplishment of the work through establishment of a position structure which ends the skills and assignments of employees with the goal of successfully performing the Installation’s mission,</li> <li>(b) the organizational structure effects a logical balance between the number of employees needed to perform the Installation’s major functions and the number of employees needed to provide adequate support; between professional employees and technicians; between full performance and trainee positions; between supervisors and subordinates, and the use of deputy positions, and</li> <li>(c) individual performance plans are linked with duties not only assigned but actually performed; and organization performance measures are linked with individual performance measures to determine overall organization effectiveness.</li> </ul> <p>(3) Based on locally established responsibility, authority and accountability, do managers receive satisfactory advisory services from the personnel office staff as to organizational and position structuring?</p>	<p>* ( <i>Introduction to Position Classification Standards, Section III; NPR 3510.1B</i>  <i>(Currently under revision)</i>)</p>

<b>C. COMPENSATION REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>1. ABSENCE AND LEAVE</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(References Below)</i> <b>PAGE C1</b>
<p>(1) Is there a written delegation of authority to approve absence and leave?</p> <p>(2) Does the Installation have guidelines for planning, scheduling, and rescheduling, annual leave?</p> <p>(3) Have the Installation’s procedures been established and communicated to employees?</p> <p>(4) Does the Installation have guidelines in place to ensure that employees are allowed to use leave as entitled under the Family and Medical Leave Act and the Family Friendly Leave Act?</p> <p>(5) Does the Installation have guidelines in place for the operation of a Voluntary Leave Transfer Program, including establishing and maintaining separate leave accounts for leave recipients?</p> <p><b><u>SAMPLE</u>:</b> Review 3 requests for restoration of annual leave and 3 cases of leave transfer to determine that:</p> <p>(6) Actions taken are in compliance with regulatory provisions.</p> <p>(7) Actions are fully and properly documented.</p> <p>(8) The restoration was approved by an official with proper authority.</p> <p>(9) Separate leave accounts have been established for restored leave and for donated leave.</p>	<p><i>(5 CFR 630.101-1211)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 630.308)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 630, Subparts D and L)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 630, Subpart I)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 630, Subpart C)</i></p>



<b>C. COMPENSATION REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>2. PAY ADJUSTMENT FOR SUPERVISORS</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 575.401-407 - more references below)</i> <b>PAGE C2</b>
<p><b><u>SAMPLE:</u></b> Review a few actions of supervisory differential to determine that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Documentation shows rationale for adjusting pay.</li> <li>(2) The justification complies with OPM/NASA regulations and guide-lines.</li> <li>(3) *The pay adjustment was authorized by an official with the proper authority.</li> <li>(4) Is there a follow-up system to discontinue supervisory differential when no longer justified?</li> </ul>	<p><i>*(NPD 3000)</i></p>
<b>3. ANNUAL PREMIUM PAY</b>	<i>(5 CFR 550, Subpart A)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Do local delegations comply with Agency requirements?</li> <li>(2) Is there a follow-up system to discontinue annual premium pay when no longer justified?</li> </ul> <p><b><u>SAMPLE:</u></b> Review annual premium pay documentation to determine that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(3) Justification is based on adequate historical records of standby duty and/or overtime.</li> <li>(4) The percentage is derived from OPM regulations.</li> <li>(5) *Cases are approved by officials with delegated authority.</li> <li>(6) Employee is not ineligible under availability pay.</li> </ul>	<p><i>(NPG 3530)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 550.161-162)</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 550.141-164)</i></p> <p><i>*</i></p> <p><i>(5 CFR 550.181)</i></p>



<b>C. COMPENSATION REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>7. PAY RATE SPECIAL FACTORS</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS</b> <i>(Guide for Processing Personnel Actions)</i> <b>PAGE C4</b>
<p><b><u>SAMPLE</u>:</b> Review personnel actions for employees with a pay rate determinant other than zero to include (if applicable): at least 1 retained grade, 1 retained pay, and 1 superior qualifications case; AND at least 1 promotion from a special rate position to a non-special rate position, and 1 conversion from GM to GS case to determine that:</p> <p>(1) *The rate of pay has been set properly.</p> <p>(2) The SF 50s clearly document special factors, e.g., superior qualifications rate, retained grade, special rate.</p> <p>(3) The decision to convert the employee from GM to GS was made properly, in accordance with applicable regulations.</p>	<p>* (5 CFR 531, Subpart B; 5 CFR 536)</p> <p>(5 CFR 531, Subpart B; 5 CFR 536)</p> <p>(5 CFR 531, Subpart B)</p>





<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>1. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <b>PAGE D1</b>
<p>(1) Has the Installation implemented the performance appraisal program in compliance with Agency and OPM requirements?</p> <p>(2) *Are plans developed for all employees in the current rating cycle?</p> <p>(3) Does personnel office have documentation to show that all employees have received a signed or otherwise documented rating for the most recently completed rating cycle?</p> <p>(4) Have performance plans changed/been improved over prior years?</p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review the performance plans for the most recently completed appraisal cycle for 5 managers/supervisors and 5 non-supervisors to include at least one job with EEO requirement, and one case with rating of “Fails to Meet Expectations”.</p> <p>(5) Do performance plans contain at least one critical element which addresses both the individual performance and the Agency Strategic Plan?</p> <p>(6) Are performance elements clear and reflect work assignments &amp; responsibilities?</p> <p>(7) Are performance elements linked to organizational and agency performance objectives?</p> <p>(8) When, appropriate, do plans reflect key managerial/supervisory responsibilities?</p> <p>(9) Are EEO considerations reflected, as appropriate?</p> <p>(10) Are performance standards and indicators clear and measurable and based on results?</p> <p>(11) Do performance plans reflect at least one progress review?</p> <p>(12) Do performance ratings include a narrative summary of performance?</p> <p>(13) Is the summary rating based on the ratings of each performance element?</p> <p>(14) Does the summary rating meet the appropriate definition?</p> <p>(15) Has performance rating of “Distinguished” and/or “Fails to Meet Expectations” been reviewed and approved by a higher level management official?</p>	<p>(5 <i>CFR</i> 430;NPG 3430)</p> <p>* [5 <i>CFR</i> 430.206(b)]</p>

<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>2. INCENTIVE/PERFORMANCE AWARDS PROGRAM</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 USC 4501-4513, CFR 451.101-451.203, NPG 3451.1 -- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE D2</b>
<p>(1) Has the installation established a program in conformance with applicable Agency and OPM requirements?</p> <p>(2) Does the program receive positive support from all levels of management?</p> <p>(3) Are awards granted to individuals, groups, and supervisors so as to encourage meeting organizational goals or improving efficiency, effectiveness and economy of operations?</p> <p>(4) Is there publicized recognition for employee contributions?</p> <p>(5) Have all individual awards granted that exceeded \$7,500 been forwarded to HQ for prior approval by the NASA Administrator?</p> <p>(6) *Have controls been established to prevent a time-off award being converted to a cash payment?</p> <p><b><u>SAMPLE:</u></b> Review 10 Performance awards (include at least 2 each of monetary and time-off awards) (include five each of non-supervisory employees and supervisors) granted during the past year.</p> <p>(7) Are awards granted in accordance with applicable OPM, Agency and Center requirements?</p> <p>(8) Have awards been processed through the agency personnel data system to enable accurate reporting to OPMs Central Personnel Data File?</p> <p>(9) *Is justification for awards not based on performance rating of record filed in Employee’s Performance File?</p> <p>(10) Does justification for awards not based on performance rating of record conform to requirements?</p> <p>(11) *Were awards approved at the proper level under delegated authorities?</p>	<p>(<i>* 5 CFR 451.104 (f)</i>)</p> <p>(<i>* 5 CFR 451.103 (c) (2); CFR 430.203 &amp; OPM Operating Guide to Personnel Recordkeeping Chapter 3 Table 3-C; and 5 CFR 293.403 (b) (2)</i>)</p> <p>*</p>

<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>3. SUGGESTION/EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 USC 4501-4513;CFR 451.101-451.203;NPG 3451.1)</i> <b>PAGE D3</b>
<p>(1) Is there evidence of management support and publicity of the program?</p> <p>(2) Have awards granted to individuals that exceeded \$7,500 been forwarded to HQ for prior approval by the Administrator?</p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review four of the suggestions submitted within the last 3 years to determine if the installation’s active program complies with OPM, Agency and Center requirements.</p> <p>(3) Was the suggestor a government employee at the time the contribution was made?</p> <p>(4) Have suggestions been outside of the suggestor’s job responsibilities or, if within them, so superior that it warranted special recognition?</p> <p>(5) Does documentation indicate that awards for suggestions have been commensurate with the benefits realized by the Government as determined by NASA’s Intangible and Tangible Benefits Scales?</p>	
<b>4. QUALITY STEP INCREASES</b>	<i>(CFR 531.501-508 &amp; NPG 3451.1 &amp; NPG 3530 -- more references below)</i>
<p><b>SAMPLE:</b> Review five of the quality step increases granted during the past year to determine if Installation processed QSI in compliance with OPM, Agency, and Installation requirements.</p> <p>(1) *Were QSI’s approved at the proper level under delegated authority?</p> <p>(2) *Was a QSI granted only once to an employee during the past 52 weeks?</p> <p>(3) Were QSI’s granted only to employees paid under the General Schedule?</p> <p>(4) Was there a written justification other than employee’s rating of record that demonstrated sustained performance of high quality significantly above that expected at the “Meets Expectations” level?</p>	<p><i>*(CFR 531.501 &amp; NPG 3530)</i></p> <p><i>*(CFR 531.505 &amp; NPG 3451.1)</i></p> <p><i>(NPG 3451.1)</i></p> <p><i>(CFR 531.504 (b)(2) &amp; NPG 3451.1)</i></p>



<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>5. WITHIN-GRADE INCREASES</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(CFR 531.401-414 &amp; NPG 3530 -- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE D4</b>
<p><b>a <u>Processing WIG’s</u></b></p> <p>(1) Is there adequate training on WIG’s to supervisors and employees?</p> <p><b><u>SAMPLE:</u></b> Review five WIG’s to determine that they are processed in accordance with Agency, OPM and local collective bargaining requirements.</p> <p>(2) Was acceptable level of competence (ALOC) determined based on most recent rating of record?</p> <p>(3) How does management assure that work reflects an ALOC (i.e., WIG not granted on an automatic basis)?</p> <p>(4) Is proper documentation in OPF?</p> <p><b>b <u>Denials of WIG’s</u></b></p> <p><b><u>SAMPLE:</u></b> Review three of the WIG denials to determine that these are processed in accordance with requirements.</p> <p>(1) Was the denial of WIG approved at the proper level under delegated authorities?</p> <p>(2) Was the negative determination done in a timely manner?</p> <p>(3) Is there adequate documentation in the case file?</p> <p>(4) Was the reconsideration of a negative determination done in a timely manner?</p>	<p><i>(CFR 531.409)</i></p>

<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>6. ACTIONS BASED ON UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 432; NPG 3432 -- more references below)</i> <b>PAGE D5</b>
<p><b><u>SAMPLE</u>:</b> Review at least 2 of the actions based on unacceptable performance for each of the last 3 years to determine that actions taken conform to applicable Agency, OPM and collective bargaining requirements.</p> <p>(1) Were performance requirements and critical elements communicated to the employees at least 90 days prior to issuance of a performance improvement plan?</p> <p>(2) Was the employee allowed a reasonable opportunity to demonstrate acceptable performance after receipt of performance improvement plan notice (minimum of 30 days)?</p> <p>(3) Was proposed action based on instances of unacceptable performance which occur within a 1 year period ending on the date of the notice of proposed action?</p> <p>(4) Were reasons for the action stated clearly and supported by the evidence?</p> <p>(5) *Were actions proposed and decided by an appropriate official?</p> <p>(6) Were actions taken within appropriate time frames?</p> <p>(7) Was the employee informed of his/her right to be represented to review the evidence relied on and to reply orally and/or in writing?</p> <p>(8) *Did the decision letter included appropriate appeal rights?</p> <p>(9) Was an evidence file maintained as required?</p>	

[illegible]



<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>9. EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBILITIES AND CONDUCT</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 CFR 735; 5 CFR Part 2635; 5 CFR 2634)</i> <b>PAGE D8</b>
<p>(1) Are standards of conduct/ethics training provided for employees in accordance with regulations?</p> <p>(2) Are copies of laws, E.O. Agency regulations and OPM regulations and instructions relating to ethical and other conduct available for review by employees?</p> <p>(3) Are files relating to requests for permission to engage in outside employment maintained and updated on a regular basis?</p> <p>(4) *Are statements of Employment and Financial Interest (OGE Form 450) processed timely, and maintained (filed) in a manner that ensures their confidentiality at all times?</p>	<p><i>*(5 CFR Part 2634, subpart I)</i></p>
<b>10. PROHIBITED PERSONNEL PRACTICES/WHISTLEBLOWING</b>	<i>(5 USC Chapter 23)</i>
<p>(1) Is a mechanism available to annually inform employees about prohibited personnel procedures/whistleblowing?</p> <p>(2) Is a procedure in place to provide training to supervisors and managers every three years to ensure their understanding of their responsibilities under the Prohibited Personnel Procedures and Whistleblower Protection Provisions?</p>	<p><i>5 USC 2302(c)</i></p> <p><i>5 USC 2302(c)</i></p> <p><i>Actions taken in accordance with Office of Special Counsel (OSC) Certification requirements</i></p>

<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>11. DRUG FREE WORKPLACE PROGRAM (DFWP)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(E.O. 12564; HHS Mandatory Guidelines; and NPG 3792.1C)</i> <b>PAGE D9</b>
<p><b>a. <u>Notifying Employees in Testing Designated Positions (TDP)</u></b></p> <p>(1) Discussions with managers, supervisors, and the personnel staff show that they understand their roles and responsibilities to evaluate job duties against TDP criteria.</p> <p>(2) Are all TDP’s periodically reviewed to verify the accuracy of the designation and TDP pool for random drug testing?</p> <p>(3) Is there a procedure in place to require an acknowledgment of receipt of the “Thirty (30) Day Notice to Employee in Testing Designated Position” for every employee occupying a TDP?</p> <p><b><u>SAMPLE:</u></b> Review up to 8 cases to include at least a couple of each of the following types of actions: reclassified position, position the duties of which changed without resulting in reclassification, and reassignment from/to a TDP.</p> <p>(4) As job duties change, are positions systematically reviewed to verify determinations as a TDP or non-TDP?</p> <p><b>b. <u>Vacancy Announcements</u></b></p> <p>(1) For any position/set of duties determined to be a TDP for which there has been a vacancy announcement, an Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) agreement, etc., has the announcement or agreement clearly stated that the position/set of duties is designated as a TDP and subject to random drug testing?</p>	

<b>D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>11. DRUG FREE WORKPLACE PROGRAM (DFWP Continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(E.O. 12564; HHS Mandatory Guidelines; and NPG 3792.1C)</i> <b>PAGE D10</b>
<p><b>c. <u>Education and Training</u></b></p> <p>(1) Is adequate information regarding the NASA Drug-Free Workplace Program (the NASA Plan for a Drug-Free Workplace, brochure, etc.) provided to new employees at the time of entrance on duty?</p> <p>(2) Does the Center have a continuing drug education program which provides information regarding drug abuse and rehabilitation to all employees on a periodic basis?</p> <p>(3) Have all supervisors been trained in accordance with regulations and Agency requirements in recognizing and addressing illegal drug use?</p> <p>(4) Is training timely and appropriately recorded for reporting purposes?</p> <p>(5) Have managers, supervisors, personnel, Employee Assistance Program (EAP) staff, and the Installation’s Medical Review Officer received appropriate guidance on their roles and responsibilities as they pertain to the DFWP?</p>	

D. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS	WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)
11. DRUG FREE WORKPLACE PROGRAM (DFWP Continued)	(E.O. 12564; HHS Mandatory Guidelines; and NPG 3792.1C) PAGE D11
d. <u>Testing for Illegal Drug Use</u>	
(1) *Is twenty-five percent (10%) of the Installation’s employees in TDP’s randomly tested for illegal drug use on an annual basis?	*( <i>NASA Plan for a Drug-Free Workplace</i> )
(2) For any employee referred through administrative channels following successful completion of a rehabilitative program, has the employee been subject to unannounced drug testing at least 4 times during the following one-year period?	
(3) For any employee scheduled for random or follow-up drug testing who is unavailable for legitimate reasons (i.e., travel, leave, time critical work assignment), is the official test list appropriately annotated to specify the reason for not testing the employee?	
(4) Is the collection of urine specimens for the purpose of testing for illegal drug use conducted in accordance with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Mandatory Guidelines?	
(5) Are all employees tested for illegal drug use notified of their test results in a timely manner?	
(6) Does the number of QC specimens submitted to the lab equal 10% of the Installation’s randomly collected urine specimens?	
(7) Is approximately 80% of the QC’s submitted to the lab for analysis negative (i.e., certified to contain no drug) and the remaining QC’s positive for only those drugs for which the Agency tests (i.e., marijuana and cocaine) and submitted proportionally (i.e., for every QC spiked with marijuana there is a QC spiked with cocaine)?	
e. <u>Records Retention and Safeguarding</u>	
(1) Is all drug testing information specifically relating to employees, including the results of such testing and an employee’s participation in the NASA EAP, maintained in accordance with all applicable law and regulations?	( <i>HHS Mandatory Guidelines</i> )
(2) Is the above information appropriately safeguarded against unauthorized access?	( <i>PL 101-71, Sec. 503(e); HHS Mandatory Guidelines, Sec. 2.7; 42 CFR, Part 2</i> )



<b>E. LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>1. MANAGEMENT SUPPORT</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(5 USC Ch.71)</i> <b>PAGE E1</b>
<p>(1) Is there a published local policy statement or is the Agency’s Labor-Management Relations (LMR) policy available?</p> <p>(2) Does the LMR staff have access to key management officials?</p> <p>(3) Does the LMR staff have the opportunity to review and provide input to new or proposed changes in personnel policies and practices and other actions that affect working conditions of bargaining unit employees prior to implementation?</p> <p>(4) Is LMR training provided for managers and supervisors who supervise bargaining unit employees?</p> <p>(5) Are copies of the labor agreement given to managers and supervisors who have direct responsibility for the work performed by members of the bargaining unit and to all bargaining unit employees?</p>	
<b>2. CONSULTATION/BARGAINING</b>	
<p>(1) *Are labor organizations given the opportunity to meet at reasonable times and to consult/bargain in a good faith effort to reach agreement with respect to conditions of employment of bargaining unit members?</p> <p>(2) Are issues that are discussed or agreed upon between management and union documented?</p> <p>(3) Is management represented at negotiations or third-party actions by someone with authority to commit management to a written agreement?</p>	<p><i>*[5 U.S.C. 7103 (a) (12); 5 USC 7117; EO 12871]</i></p>

<b>E. LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS REVIEW ITEMS</b> <b>3. REPRESENTATION BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <b>PAGE E2</b>
<p>(1) *Are labor organization given the opportunity to be represented at formal discussions between management and employees or employee representatives concerning grievances, personnel policies and practices, or other general conditions of employment?</p> <p>(2) *Are employees in exclusive bargaining units notified annually of their right to be represented at any examination of an employee by a management representative where the employee (a) believes discipline may result and (b) requests such representation? (Weingarten right)</p>	<p><i>*(5 U.S.C. 7121 (b) (3) (A) (B); 5 USC 7114)</i></p> <p><i>*[5 U.S.C. 7114 (a) (3)]</i></p>
<b>4. USE OF OFFICIAL TIME</b>	
<p>(1) *Have procedures and controls been developed and maintained to account for official time used?</p>	<p><i>*(5 USC 7131)</i></p>
<b>5. CONTINGENCY PLANS</b>	
<p>(1) Have current contingency plans been developed establishing local procedures for dealing with work stoppages or other disruptive activities?</p>	<p><i>[5 USC 7103 (a) (4) (D); 7116 (b) (7); 7311 (3); OPM Guidance Bulletin No. 14, June 1982, “Strike Contingency Plan”</i></p>
<b>UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE (ULP) ALLEGATIONS/GRIEVANCES</b>	
<p>(1) Are ULP’s reviewed to determine if any basic management practices need to be addressed/changed to avoid future problems?</p> <p>(2) Are grievances under the collective bargaining unit reviewed to determine if any basic management practices need to be addressed/changed to avoid future problems?</p>	

<b>F. MANAGEMENT CONTROLS</b> <b>1. SUMMARY REPORT ON CONTROL ENVIRONMENT</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> (NASA Desk Guide DG-06, Sections A through E) <b>PAGE G1</b>
<p>Cyclic summary reports verify that the overall personnel office environment effectively assures internal controls are in place and used as planned. Documentation of the following items form the basis of a cyclic management control review and are to be maintained for at least 6 months after the date of the summary report.</p> <p><b>a. <u>Data &amp; records are up-to-date and accurate.</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are personnel processing action records maintained in accordance with OPM and NASA requirements?</p> <p>(2) Have procedures and controls been developed to insure accurate accounting of official time used by employee bargaining unit representatives?</p> <p>(3) Is justification for those awards not based on performance rating of record, filed in Employee’s Performance File?</p> <p>(4) Was a QSI granted only once to an employee during the past 52 weeks?</p> <p>(5) Are grievance files established/maintained in accordance with requirements?</p> <p><b>b. <u>Program operating procedures and activities are clearly documented &amp; adequate upon examination.</u></b></p> <p>(1) Since the most recent self-assessment summery report, do OPM reviews of delegated examining operations confirm satisfactory program operation?</p> <p>(2) Do competitive placement procedures follow guideline requirements?</p> <p>(3) Does employment of experts/consultants follow guideline requirements?</p> <p>(4) Do Intergovernmental Personnel Act assignments adhere to assignment and service time requirements?</p> <p>(5) Do local issuances on position management comply with NASA requirements?</p> <p>(6) Have pay rates been properly set?</p> <p>(7) Have controls been established to prevent a time-off award being converted to a cash payment?</p>	<p>(Item A10 (6))</p> <p>(Item E4 (1))</p> <p>(Item D2 (9))</p> <p>(Item D4 (2))</p> <p>(Item D8 (3))</p> <p>(Most recent OPM Report on delegated examining)</p> <p>(Item A4)</p> <p>(Item A7 (1) through (7))</p> <p>(Item A8 c (1)( c))</p> <p>(Item B5 (1))</p> <p>(Item C7 (1))</p> <p>(Item D2 (6))</p>

<b>F. MANAGEMENT CONTROLS</b> <b>1. SUMMARY REPORT ON CONTROL ENVIRONMENT (continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(NASA Desk Guide DG-06, Sections A through E)</i> <b>PAGE G2</b>
<p><b>c. <u>Appropriate procedures are established and followed to assign and approve work of HR functional staff.</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are recruitment travel costs considered reasonable including cost for interview trips?</p> <p>(2) Are performance plans developed for <u>all</u> personnel office employees?</p> <p><b>d. <u>Significant activities are authorized and performed only by persons acting within their assigned authority.</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are there indications of major problems in recruitment planning regarding management participation in plan development?</p> <p>(2) Is there a written delegation covering each official that classifies positions at the Installation?</p> <p>(3) Were the following actions authorized by officials with proper authority: supervisory pay adjustments, annual premium pay, highest previous rate, hours of duty, compensatory time and awards?</p> <p>(4) Were the following actions approved at the proper level under delegated authority: quality step increases, actions based on unacceptable performance, and adverse and disciplinary actions.</p> <p>(5) Are the labor organizations given the opportunity to meet at reasonable times and to consult/bargain/partner in good faith effort to reach agreement with respect to conditions of employment of bargaining unit members?</p> <p><b>e. <u>Key duties and responsibilities are separated among individuals.</u></b></p> <p>(1) Were position descriptions reviewed and certified by the first-line supervisors?</p> <p>(2) Have positions been classified by an official to whom classification authority is delegated?</p>	<p><i>(Item A1b (3))</i></p> <p><i>(Item D1 (2)) adapted</i></p> <p><i>(Item A1a (4))</i></p> <p><i>(Item B1 (2))</i></p> <p><i>(Items C2 (3), C3 (5), C4 (3), C5 (1), C6 (2), D2 (11))</i></p> <p><i>(Items D4 (1), D6 (5), D7 (1))</i></p> <p><i>Item E2 (1)</i></p> <p><i>(Item B1 (3) (a))</i></p> <p><i>(Item B1 (3) (b))</i></p>

<b>F. MANAGEMENT CONTROLS</b> <b>1. SUMMARY REPORT ON CONTROL ENVIRONMENT (continued)</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(NASA Desk Guide DG-06, Sections A through E)</i> <b>PAGE G3</b>
<p>(3) Were the employees notified of appropriate appeal rights in actions based on unacceptable performance, adverse actions, or discipline?</p> <p>(4) Is 25% of the employee’s in TDP’s randomly tested for illegal drug use on an annual basis?</p> <p>(5) Are labor organizations given the opportunity to be represented at formal discussions between management and employees or employee representatives concerning grievances, personnel polices and practices, or other general conditions of employment?</p> <p>(6) Are employees in exclusive bargaining units notified annually of their right to be represented at any examination of an employee by a management representative where the employee (a) believes discipline may result and (b) requests such representation? (Weingarten right)</p> <p><b><u>f. Procedures are followed to limit access of resources/records to authorized personnel.</u></b></p> <p>(1) Are personnel action records properly safeguarded against any unauthorized access or the preparation of fictitious records?</p> <p>(2) Have steps been taken to assure the confidentiality of statements of Employment and Financial Interest (OGF Form 450) at all times.</p>	<p><i>(Items D6 (8), D7 (5))</i></p> <p><i>(Item D11 d(1))</i></p> <p><i>(Item E3 (1))</i></p> <p><i>(Item E3 (2))</i></p> <p><i>(Item A10 (7))</i></p> <p><i>(Item D9 (4))</i></p>
<b>F. MANAGEMENT CONTROLS</b> <b>2. DEFICIENCY RESOLUTION</b>	<b>WAS REVIEW ITEM MET? (“YES” OR “NO” WITH COMMENTS)</b> <i>(NASA Desk Guide DG-06, Sections A through E)</i>
<p>(1) Corrective action is initiated for any deficiency identified above within 60 days of its discovery through self-assessment.</p> <p>(2) Root problems for grievances are addressed and resolved by management in a proactive way to avoid future grievances.</p>	<p><i>(Item D8 (2))</i></p>